

Appl. No. 09/919,994
Amdt. dated May 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 29, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 34-45 are pending in the application, with claims 1-33 having been canceled, and new claims 34-45 having been added.

All claims previously pending the application have been canceled and new claims 34-45 presented in an effort to clarify the features of the present invention and to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as their invention, and to rectify inadvertent errors that had appeared previously.

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 29, 32, and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement because, according to the Examiner, they contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as reasonably to convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The examiner states that he has reviewed the specification and has not found support for the use of a first solvent and a second solvent or for multiple additions of solvent at different stages of the process. He also states that, since the specification is silent regarding the use of a first and second solvent or the multiple additions of solvent at different stages of the process, such features as the relationship of one solvent to the other, how and when the second solvent is introduced into the system, and how or if the first solvent is removed cannot be determined.

Appl. No. 09/919,994
Amdt. dated May 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 29, 2007

None of the claims currently pending in the application refers to the use of first and second solvents or to multiple additions of solvent at different stages of the process.

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-12, 29, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 29, 32, and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement because, according to the Examiner:

"The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As aforementioned, support has not been found for the use of a first solvent and a second solvent or for the multiple additions of solvent at different stages of the process; therefore, the position is taken that applicants have failed to provide adequate enablement for the use of multiple solvent components or multiple solvent additions within a process for removing free polyisocyanate monomer from a prepolymer composition.

Absent guidance with respect to the use of such multiple solvent components or multiple additions, the position is taken

Appl. No. 09/919,994
Amdt. dated May 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 29, 2007

that the skilled artisan could not practice the invention without resorting to undue experimentation."

None of the claims currently pending in the application refers to the use of first and second solvents or to multiple additions of solvent at different stages of the process.

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-12, 29, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 29, 32, and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

More specifically, according to the Examiner:

"Applicants' amendments relating to the use of a first solvent and a second solvent render the claims indefinite, because the relationship of one solvent to the other, how and when the second solvent is introduced into the system, and the removal of the first solvent cannot be determined. Furthermore, it is unclear if the first solvent and second solvent can be satisfied by a single solvent component."

None of the claims currently pending in the application refers to the use of first and second solvents or to multiple additions of solvent at different stages of the process.


Appl. No. 09/919,994
Amdt. dated May 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 29, 2007

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-12, 29, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance and an early Office Action to that end is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

16 MAY 07
Date

 Reg. No. 30,754
for James L. Lewis
Reg. No. 24,732

LEVY & GRANDINETTI
Suite 408
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1419

(202) 429-4560